REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 21-24, and 26-40 are pending in the application, with claims 21, 28, and 34 being independent. Claims 1-20 and 41 were previously canceled and claim 25 is canceled herein. Claims 21, 28, 30-36, and 39 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. No new matter has been added.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative, Elizabeth Zehr, on Wednesday April 15, 2009.

During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the §103(a) rejection as applied to claims 21 and 34. Specifically, Applicant's representative presented arguments addressing the elements recited in the claims. The Examiner indicated that further clarification with respect to the title attribute element of independent claim 21 would likely improve the condition of the claims; however, an additional search of the related art specifically focusing on the Tonaka reference would be required in light of the proposed amendments. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication and has presented the claims accordingly along with the arguments presented during the telephone interview.

The subject matter of the interview, and other remarks, are included below under

their respective sections to assist the Examiner in more fully understanding the Applicant's position on the rejections under §103(a).

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 21-24, 26-28, 30-31, and 34-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,418,528 ("Hosack") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,075,684 ("DeLuca"). Claims 25, 29, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosack in view of DeLuca and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0228909 ("Tanaka"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Hosack is directed to "A method, in a radio receiver for receiving messages from a plurality of sources, for prioritizing a deletion order for received messages." (Summary). Specifically, "each of the plurality of sources" are designated "as anchored sources or unanchored sources" such that "the anchored messages are deleted only after deletion of stored messages which are not flagged as anchored messages." (Summary).

DeLuca teaches filtering incoming messages based on a single source identifier of the message. Specifically, all messages that have the same source identifier are placed into a common "source file with an assigned number of message storage slots." (Column 3, lines 1-3). If the source file is full, then DeLuca further teaches deleting the earliest received message from that source.

Independent claim 21, as presently presented, recites:

> One or more computer readable storage media storing computer-implementable instructions that cause one or more processors to perform acts comprising:
>
> receiving a new message from an online gaming player associated with an online gaming service;
>
> identifying a sender name of the new message that identifies the gaming player that sent the message;
>
> identifying a title attribute of the new message that identifies a title of a specific game of the online gaming service from which the new message originated;
>
> storing the new message, the sender name, and the title attribute in a message queue associated with a targeted recipient of the new message;
>
> determining whether the message queue has more than a message queue threshold number of messages; and
>
> deleting one of the messages from the queue based on the sender name and the title attribute when the queue includes more than the message queue threshold number of messages, wherein deleting one of the messages from the queue comprises:
>
> deleting a message in the queue that has the title attribute of the new message regardless of the sender name of the new message when a sender name count exceeds a sender name threshold and when an attribute title count exceeds an attribute title threshold.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hosack and DeLuca whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the recitations of claim 21 for at least two reasons. First, Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest "storing the new message, the sender name, and the title attribute in a message queue associated with a targeted recipient of the new message" where the title attribute "identifies an application from which the new message originated" as recited in claim 21.

The Office acknowledges that, with reference to the rejection of claim 21: "deleting one of the messages from the queue when the queue includes more than the

message queue threshold number of messages [Hosack, figure 3 and column 4, lines 40-52]." (Office action, page 3) Applicant submits that the cited portion of Hosack teaches deleting messages from a full database in the following order: (1) "the oldest read, unanchored message"; (2) "the oldest unread, unanchored message"; (3) "the oldest read, anchored message"; and (4) "the oldest unread, anchored message." (Hosack, column 4, lines 40-68). Accordingly, the messages in Hosack are stored using only two flags. Specifically, Hosack "stores an indication (shown as an 'r' for read and a 'u' for unread) of whether or not the message has been read by the user and a flag (shown as a lower case 'a') indicating whether the message is 'anchored'." (Column 3, lines 55-59).

With respect to anchored messages, a status database of Hosack stores "a status of each of the sources" from which the radio receiver can receive messages "as being 'anchored' or 'unanchored'" such that "the last received message on each anchored source is designated by the CPU 220 as an anchored message for that source." (Column 3, lines 61-65; Column 4, lines 3-5). Since the message database 252 of Hosack stores the messages based on the source of the message and the source of the message, as used in Hosack, identifies "for example, personal sources, business sources, or information sources", Hosack fails to store the messages based on both "a title attribute of the new message that identifies an application from which the new message originated" and a "sender name of the new message that identifies a user logged onto the client device" as recited in claim 21.

Applicant further submits that since Hosack fails to store messages based on a title attribute and a sender name, Hosack accordingly fails to teach or suggest "deleting a

message in the queue that has the title attribute of the new message regardless of the sender name of the new message when a sender name count exceeds a sender name threshold and when an attribute title count exceeds an attribute title threshold." Specifically, Hosack is silent as to a "sender name threshold" and an "attribute title threshold". Rather, Hosack simply deletes an oldest message in the queue based on whether the message has been read and whether the message is anchored.

DeLuca fails to remedy the deficiencies in Hosack noted above with respect to claim 21 since DeLuca fails to teach or suggest storing messages based on "the sender name, and the title attribute in a message queue" as recited in claim 21.

Second, as discussed during the interview, Hosack in view of DeLuca further fails to teach or suggest "identifying a title attribute of the new message that identifies a title of a specific game of the online gaming service from which the new message originated" as recited in claim 21. Specifically, neither Hosack nor DeLuca pertain to online gaming services and thus Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest identifying "a title of a specific game of the online gaming service from which the new message originated." During the Examiner interview, the Examiner indicated that a search of the Tanaka reference would be necessary. In light of the Interview, Applicant submits that Tanaka further fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies of Hosack and DeLuca noted above. Specifically, Applicant submits that Hosack in view of DeLuca and Tanaka fails to teach or suggest "identifying a title attribute of the new message that identifies a title of a specific game of the online gaming service from which the new message originated" as recited in claim 21.

Tanaka is directed to displaying messages exchanged between players of a video game. The messages are displayed in a chat window that "is sequentially enlarged up to a preset maximum number of lines when a new message is received from the game server apparatus." (Abstract). Specifically, the chat window displays "[c]ommunications among the players" as well as "[i]nformation, which the non-player characters give the player character, and information, which indicates a result of the battle." (Tanaka, Paragraph [0037]). Furthermore, when the number of messages in the chat window display has reached the preset maximum number of lines, "the oldest message displayed at the uppermost position of the chat window 350 is deleted." (*Id.*, Paragraph [0090]).

Applicant submits that the only information provided in Tanaka relating to the source of the message is the name of the gaming user that sent the message. Tanaka is silent as to identifying "a title of a specific game of the online gaming service from which the new message originated" since Tanaka assumes that the message originated from within the same game title that the recipient of the message is playing. Applicant's claim 21, on the other hand, is not limited in this manner and thus Tanaka fails to teach or suggest "identifying a title attribute of the new message that identifies a title of a specific game of the online gaming service from which the new message originated" as recited in claim 21.

Due to the Applicant's earnest belief that the claim 21, as rejected under Section 103, is believed allowable for reciting elements which are not taught or suggested in the cited references, Applicant will not address motivation to combine with respect to claim 21 during this response. However, Applicant hereby reserves the right to further

challenge motivation to combine the cited references.

Accordingly, claim 21 is believed allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Dependent claims 22-27 depend from independent claim 21 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Although all dependent claims may recite limitations not taught or suggested by Hosack in view of DeLuca, only claim 24 is discussed below.

Claim 24 recites:

> One or more computer readable media as recited in claim 21, wherein the deleting one of the messages from the queue further comprises deleting an oldest message in the queue that has the attribute title of the new message when the attribute title count exceeds the attribute title threshold.

Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest the recitations of claim 24. Specifically, Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest "deleting an oldest message in the queue that has the attribute title of the new message when the attribute title count exceeds the attribute title threshold." The Office cited Hosack for allegedly teaching the elements of claim 24. Specifically, the Office recites: Hosack-DeLuca discloses "deleting one of the messages from the queue further comprises deleting an oldest message in the queue that has the attribute title of the new message when the attribute title count exceeds the attribute title threshold [Hosack, column 40, lines 40-52 and column 5, lines 12-19]." (Office action, page 4, line 16 through page 5, line 3).

Applicant submits that Hosack teaches deleting messages based on whether the message is read/unread and further based on whether the message is anchored. (*See* Hosack, column 4, lines 40-69). Since neither of these two message attributes identify "a

title of a specific game of the online gaming service from which the new message originated", Hosack fails to teach or suggest "deleting an oldest message in the queue that has the attribute title of the new message when the attribute title count exceeds the attribute title threshold" as recited in claim 24 including the recitations of independent claim 21.

DeLuca is silent as to teaching an attribute title count as used in Applicant's claim 24 and thus fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies of Hosack.

Accordingly, claims 22-27 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Independent claim 28, as presently presented, recites:

> A method for intelligent message deletion, the method comprising:
> determining whether a queue for a targeted recipient of the new message has more than a message queue threshold number of messages;
> determining a first sender attribute count based on the number of messages in the queue sent from a sender of the new message;
> determining a second sender attribute count based on the number of messages in the queue that originated from a game that sent the new message, the game associated with an online gaming service;
> deleting a message from the queue based on both the first sender attribute count and the second sender attribute count; and
> adding the new message to the queue.

(Emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that Hosack and DeLuca whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the recitations of claim 28 for at least two reasons. First, Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest "deleting a message from the queue based on both the first sender attribute count and the second sender

attribute count" as recited in claim 28.

The Office cited Hosack for allegedly teaching the cited elements of claim 28. Applicant submits that Hosack fails to disclose the elements of claim 28 because Hosack deletes messages based on whether the message is read/unread and further based on whether the message is anchored rather than based on a first sender attribute and a second sender attribute. Specifically, Hosack recites: "messages are deleted from the message database 252 in an order determined first by the anchor status of the message sources, then by whether or not the messages have been read by the user, and then by the time of reception." (Column 5, lines 29-33). Of the three message properties used by Hosack to delete messages, only the anchor status of the message identifies a source of the message and thus Hosack fails to teach or suggest deleting messages "based on both the first sender attribute count and the second sender attribute count."

DeLuca was not cited for deleting a message of the queue as used in Applicant's claim 28 and DeLuca fails to remedy the deficiencies in Hosack noted above with respect to claim 28.

Second, Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest "determining a second sender attribute count based on the number of messages in the queue that originated from a game that sent the new message, the game associated with an online gaming service" as recited in claim 28. Specifically, neither Hosack nor DeLuca pertain to online gaming services and thus Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest the cited elements of claim 28. Further, in light of the Interview, Applicant submits that Tanaka fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies of Hosack and DeLuca since Tanaka identifies

only the gaming user that sent the message rather than the "game that sent the new message."

Accordingly, claim 28 is believed allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Dependent claims 29-33 depend from independent claim 28 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Independent claim 34, as presently presented, recites:

> An online gaming service, comprising:
> a message component having a memory to maintain a message queue for each of a plurality of users associated with the gaming service; and
> an intelligent message deletion module of the messaging component to:
> identify a first sender attribute of a newly received message that identifies an online gaming player that sent the newly received message;
> identify a second sender attribute of the newly received message that identifies a title of an online game that sentthe newly received message;
> add the newly received message to a target queue associated with a target user of the plurality of users that is a recipient of the newly received message; and
> delete a previously received message from the target queue based on the number of messages in the target queue that have the first sender attribute of the newly received message and the number of messages in the target queue that have the second sender attribute of the newly received message when the target queue includes more than a message queue threshold number of messages.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hosack and DeLuca whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the recitations of claim 34. Specifically, Hosack in view of DeLuca fails to teach or suggest "a message component having memory to

maintain a message queue for each of a plurality of users associated with the gaming service" as recited in claim 34. (Emphasis added).

Applicant submits that each radio receiver 110 of Hosack includes its own memory to store a message database specific to that radio receiver only rather than teaching a memory that includes message queues for a plurality of users. Specifically, Hosack teaches "a message database 252" of a radio receiver 110 "into which information stored in the message buffer 245 is moved when space within the message database 252 is sufficient." (Hosack, column 3, lines 48-55). The cited element of Applicant's claim 34, on the other hand, recites "memory to maintain a message queue for each of a plurality of users."

DeLuca fails to remedy the deficiencies in Hosack noted above with respect to claim 34. Specifically, although DeLuca teaches a "memory 36 is coupled to the microprocessor controller 34 for storing those messages containing the address of the selective call receiver as determined by the microprocessor controller 34" (DeLuca, column 2, lines 37-40), DeLuca fails to teach or suggest "memory to maintain a message queue for each of a plurality of users *associated with the gaming service*" as recited in claim 36. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, claim 34 is believed allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Dependent claims 35-40 depend from independent claim 34 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21-24, and 26-40 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action, and could not have been presented previously because Applicant earnestly believed that the claims were in condition for allowance at the time of filing the previous response.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue**.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: 2009-06-04 By: _____

Damon J. Kruger
Reg. No. 60400
Elizabeth J. Zehr
Reg No. 64013
206-315-4001